

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Eddie Jones v. California Dept. of Corrections, et al.

No. 2:25-cv-01274-CKD-P (E.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2025) · No. 2:25-cv-01274-CKD-P · Decided September 11,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States Magistrate Judge grants Eddie Jones’s application to proceed in forma pauperis and recommends dismissal of his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint without leave to amend. The document concludes that the California Department of Corrections and California Health Care Facility are immune from suit and that the alleged failure to prevent a fall and delayed grievance response do not state constitutional claims. Plaintiff is given 14 days to file objections to the findings and recommendations.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 11, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01274-CKD-P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se state prisoner brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the California Department of Corrections and California Health Care Facility. On screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the magistrate judge found that the complaint failed to state a claim and issued findings and recommendations that it be dismissed without leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; the complaint must be dismissed if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Eddie Jones v. California Dept. of Corrections, California Health Care Facility

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

due process

eleventh amendment immunity

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the California Department of Corrections and California Health Care Facility are immune from suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether allegations that prison officials failed to train staff to prevent a prisoner's fall state an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim.
3. Whether delay in responding to a prison grievance states a Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim.
4. Whether the complaint should be dismissed without leave to amend because its defects cannot be cured by amendment.

HOLDINGS

1. The California Department of Corrections and prisons within it are immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment; therefore, the two defendants named in the complaint cannot be sued under § 1983.
2. Allegations that defendants failed to train staff to take steps to prevent plaintiff's fall allege, at most, an ordinary lack of due care and do not establish deliberate indifference to a substantial risk of serious harm.
3. A prisoner has no constitutional entitlement to a particular prison grievance procedure or timely response, so delay in processing a grievance does not state a Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim absent a protected life, liberty, or property interest.
4. The complaint should be dismissed without leave to amend because amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In addition, it is clear under the facts alleged that plaintiff was not deprived of any right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States." (at 4)

"Plaintiff cannot show a protected interest is at stake as he has no constitutional entitlement to a specific prison grievance procedure." (at 4)

"In this instance, further amendment would be futile." (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that the California Department of Corrections and California Health Care Facility failed to train staff to take reasonable steps to prevent an unsafe condition, causing him to fall and suffer injury on October 18, 2024. He also alleged that the Office of Appeals responded late to a grievance submitted on December 11, 2024. Plaintiff named the governmental entities themselves as defendants and proceeded without counsel.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil-rights complaint alleging unsafe prison conditions and denial of due process based on delay in processing a grievance. The court granted plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis, screened the complaint, and recommended dismissal without leave to amend. The findings and recommendations were submitted to the assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), subject to objections within 14 days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- Brown v. Cal. Dep't of Corrs., 554 F.3d 747, 752 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Morgan v. Morgensen, 465 F.3d 1041, 1045 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Whitley v. Albers, 475 U.S. 312, 319 (1986)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 835-37 & n. 4 (1994)
- Toguchi v. Chung, 391 F.3d 1051, 1057 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Buckley v. Barlow, 997 F.2d 494, 495 (8th Cir. 1993)
- Wilkinson v. Austin, 545 U.S. 209, 221 (2005)
- Ramirez v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 860 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1105-06 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Klamath-Lake Pharm. Ass'n v. Klamath Med. Serv. Bureau, 701 F.2d 1276, 1293 (9th Cir. 1983)
- Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)